CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
REGULAR MEETING

MARCH 7, 2006

CALL TO ORDER:
Mayor Lavagnino called the Regular Meeting of the City Council to order at 6:30 p.m.

INVOCATION:
Pastor Dave Brogren of the Santa Maria Community Church gave the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:
Councilmember Trujillo led the pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:
MEMBERS PRESENT
Councilmembers Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT
City Manager Ness, Assistant City Manager Haydon, City Attorney Trujillo, Police Chief Macagni, Director of Community Development Lindsey, Fire Chief Ortiz, Director of Utilities Chisam, Director of Public Works/City Engineer Sweet, Planner III Shipsey, Principal Engineer Nybo, and Chief Deputy City Clerk Perez.

PROCLAMATION – ADULT EDUCATION WEEK
Councilmember Patino read a proclamation declaring the week of March 12-18, 2006, as "Adult Education Week" in the City of Santa Maria, celebrating the Sesquicentennial Anniversary of Adult Education in California with its theme *California Adult Education: Bridges to Success for 150 Years*, and saluting the administration, teachers, and students of the Santa Maria Joint Union High School Adult School and honoring their efforts and accomplishments. The proclamation was accepted by Craig Huseth, Director of Alternative Education for Santa Maria Joint Union High School District.

PROCLAMATION - PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORK MONTH
Councilmember Orach read a proclamation declaring the month of March 2006 as "Professional Social Work Month" in the City of Santa Maria, in recognition of professional social workers and their commitment and dedication to individuals, families and communities through legislative advocacy, service delivery, research and education. The proclamation was accepted by Anna Ventura of the Clinical Social Work Department of Marian Medical Center.

PROCLAMATION – ARBOR DAY
Councilmember Mariscal read a proclamation declaring March 8, 2006, as "Arbor Day" in the City of Santa Maria, and encouraging community members to plant a tree in observance of Arbor Day 2006 or to make a donation to the Recreation and Parks Department's Tree of Life program to regenerate our City's urban forest. The proclamation was accepted by Max Tucker, President of Santa Maria Valley Beautiful.

PROCLAMATION – CERT TRAINING GRADUATES
Mayor Lavagnino read a proclamation commending and congratulating the graduates of the 28-hour Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Training sponsored by the Fire Department for their commitment to our community through their unselfish participation in the CERT Training. The proclamation was accepted by Fire Chief Ortiz. Certificates of Completion were presented each of the 22 graduates.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Sister Janet Corcoran spoke in support of the bond measure on the June ballot for Allan Hancock Community College for improvements to the College's infrastructure to meet the needs of the students. She also spoke in support of Arbor Day.

Ernest Armenta requested Planning Commission and Recreation and Parks Commission meetings be televised on Public Access TV and spoke in opposition to a ballot measure to reauthorize Measure D.

Jose Luis Castellanos, MAPA, requested each of the Councilmembers publicly announce his/her position on the County split proposal.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Councilmember Patino commented on Item 3H, a Notice of Completion for the Street Maintenance Chip Seal project. She read a sentence from the staff report "preventative maintenance done in the first 75 percent of pavement life may cost one dollar per unit; remedial work done during the last 25 percent of life may cost five to twenty dollars per unit." She indicated that was the type of thing voters needed to think about when the Measure D reauthorization is on the ballot.

Consent Calendar Items A through L were approved with the indicated action on motion by Councilmember Orach, seconded by Councilmember Patino, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmember Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

A. ORDINANCES
The reading in full of all ordinances and resolutions was waived. Ordinances on the Consent Calendar are adopted by the same vote cast at the first reading unless City Council indicates otherwise.

B. MINUTES
The Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting of February 21, 2006, were approved as submitted.

C. BOND RELEASES
Council accepted as complete certain public improvements and authorized the release of a Faithful Performance Bond in the reduced amount of $10,000 for the construction and installation of public improvements, with the order that the Contractor, Labor and Material Bond be held until September 2006 and the Guarantee and Defective Material Bond be held until March 2007 and a Faithful Performance Bond in the amount of $2,416 for the installation of 24 street and easement trees, including maintenance for one year posted in connection with Mission Creek, Tract 5847.

D. BOND RELEASE
Council accepted as complete certain public improvements and authorized the release of a Faithful Performance Bond in the amount of $2,500 for the construction and installation of public improvements, with the order that the Contractor, Labor and Material Bond be held until September 2006 and the Guarantee and Defective Material Bond be held until March 2007 posted in connection with Parkside IV, Tract 5736.

E. WARRANTS
Warrant Nos. 125719 to 125947 in the amount of $1,211,134.93 were ordered ratified subject to having been certified as being in conformity with the budget and having been approved for payment by the Director of Administrative Services. Warrant Nos. 121777, 122202, and 125094 were cancelled.

F. PAYROLL
Payment of payroll was ordered ratified subject to having been certified by the proper Department Heads, as shown on records on file in the Department of Administrative Services and having been approved for payment by the Director of Administrative Services.

G. FOOTE ANNEXATION PETITION
Council referred the Foote Annexation Petition (APN 117-820-001) to the Planning Commission for consolidation into the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Reorganization (AN-106). This is a seven-acre piece of property located along the east side of Black Road, north of the Santa Maria Valley Railroad, and west of the City-owned property that is proposed for annexation.

H. NOTICE OF COMPLETION
Council approved the filing of a Notice of Contract Completion for Street Maintenance (Chip Seal), Bid No. 2005/14.

I. ONE-HOUR PARKING ZONE
Resolution No. 2006-28 was adopted approving a recommendation of the Traffic Committee to establish Limited Time (One-Hour) Parking Zones on Roemer Way for Roemer Way Self-Storage.

Resolution No. 2006-28 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING ONE-HOUR LIMITED TIME PARKING ZONES ON ROEMER WAY PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-5.14 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE.

J. ONE-HOUR PARKING ZONE
Resolution No. 2006-29 was adopted approving a recommendation from the Traffic Committee to establish a Limited Time (One-Hour) Parking Zone on Main Street and Curryer Street for Andy's Cabinet and Granite.

Resolution No. 2006-29 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING ONE-HOUR LIMITED TIME PARKING ZONES ON MAIN STREET AND CURRYER STREET PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-5.14 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE.

K. NO STOPPING ZONE
Resolution No. 2006-30 was adopted approving a recommendation of the Traffic Committee to establish a no stopping zone on Carlotti Drive near Noble Way.

Resolution No. 2006-30 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A NO STOPPING ZONE ON CARLOTTI DRIVE PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-5.16 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE.

L. NO STOPPING ZONE
Resolution No. 2006-31 was adopted approving a recommendation of the Traffic Committee to establish no stopping zones on Donovan Road near North Canyon Road and Will Street.

Resolution No. 2006-31 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING NO STOPPING ZONES ON DONOVAN ROAD PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-5.16 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE.

PRESENTATION ON MEASURE D REAUTHORIZATION
Jim Kemp, Executive Director of the Santa Barbara Council of Governments (SBCAG), presented a summary of Measure D which will expire in 2010. SBCAG is in the process of drafting a renewal plan for Measure D. Measure D is a one-half cent sales tax that was imposed in 1989 by a County-wide vote. It will generate $500 million during the 20-year term. An additional $60 million has been leveraged by having Measure D funds. Approximately half of the local road repair work in the County is funded by Measure D funds. The spending priorities were established in an expenditure plan that was approved in 1989. The expenditure plan is made up of three components: local program (70 percent of the dollars allocated on a formula basis); regional program (29.5 percent of total revenues); and a specialized program for people with specialized transportation needs (.5 percent of total revenues). Over the life of Measure D, the City

of Santa Maria will receive over $62 million. The local program allows local jurisdictions to do road repair and maintenance, streets, sidewalks, bike lanes, transit services, and street tree maintenance. The regional program is estimated to generate $139 million over the term. It is used for a variety of projects throughout the County. There were 15 projects identified in the regional program with 14 of them already completed. The specialized transit program provides money for the local paratransit operators such as Santa Maria Area Transit (SMAT) and provides operating subsidizes and fare reductions for seniors and disabled individuals. Measure D has provided local governments with funding that stays in the County and is flexible to address current needs in each community. The funds have been dependable.

Larry Tramutola, Tramutola, LLC, consultant for SBCAG, provided an overview of the steps taken to date to develop a ballot measure to reauthorize Measure D. Initially, they met with all the City Managers in the County, various interest groups, and transportation experts. The first major challenge encountered was that there is about $3 billion in transportation needs in the County. Measure D as a renewal would raise about $1 billion over a 30-year period. Second, there was a formula that was developed when Measure D was passed. Conversations about changing the formula or changing the structure have been difficult. Third, any proposal on the ballot must be supported by 2/3's of the voters. Fourth, what the public wants is balance. They want balance in terms of congestion relief, highway renovation and improvements, and street and road maintenance. Two different polls have been done. Transportation is on the top of the list of Santa Barbara County voters. When asked what the highest priority was, alternative transportation ranked highest, followed closely by congestion relief, maintaining the infrastructure, and highway safety. A simply renewal of Measure D would not provide the revenue to be able to do all the projects, and it would not provide the balance the public wants. Three options were provided to the SBCAG Board: do nothing at this time; do a simple tax extension of the existing Measure D; and the proposal for an A and B measure. Measure A would be an extension of the existing half-cent sales tax, and Measure B would be a quarter-cent increase. Between the two there would be about $1.6 billion in projects that could be funded over the 20-30 year term. At this time SBCAG is gathering input that would be used to put together a plan that might be supported by the voters.

Jim Kemp highlighted the proposed A + B measure. Measure A would be a renewal of the existing half-cent sales tax measure. Measure B would be a companion measure on the ballot at the same time and would be a new quarter-cent sales tax increase. Measure B would become effective only if Measures A and B passed by 2/3's of the voters. Under Measure A, 60 percent of the revenues would be allocated to the cities and the county which would generate $630 million. If Measure A and B were to pass, it would generate $787 million over the 30-year period. City of Santa Maria could expect to receive $128 million from Measure A. Under Measure B, more money is proposed for regional projects in the South County with $53 million going to South County jurisdictions. For North County jurisdictions $104 million would be allocated for local projects to make up for the fact that the south part of the County would be receiving more money for regional projects. Widening Highway 101 between the Ventura County line and the City of Santa Barbara is the only project that is proposed for highway funding at $140 million from Measures A and B. In terms of North County highway projects, there are a number of smaller projects proposed for a total of $126 million for highway improvement projects. There are also a number of transit and transportation projects such as an inter-regional bus program that would provide funding to continue and expand the current Clean Air Express, Valley Express and Coastal Express intercity bus services. A commuter rail system would be established to carry commuters from Ventura County to Santa Barbara and Goleta to relieve congestion on Highway 101. Local and regional bus service would receive $206 million to continue and expand the services provided. Continuation of the Safe Routes to Schools program, bike paths, encouraging the use of carpools and van pools, and other forms of alternative transportation would be funded under Measures A and B.

Larry Tramutola explained that when they conducted the polls, Measure A was supported by more than 2/3's of the voters polled, while Measure B was supported by slightly less than 2/3's of the voters.

Jim Kemp concluded with a timeline for getting the ballot measure on the ballot in November. Before it can be put on the ballot, it must receive approval by the SBCAG Board, by the Board of Supervisors, and a majority of the City Councils of the County. They will be back in May to request support of the Council.

Councilmember Orach asked if the proposed split for local programs under Measure A + B was 60 percent/40 percent split rather than the current 70 percent/30 percent split.

Mr. Kemp replied that was correct.

Councilmember Mariscal asked if Mr. Kemp could compare and contrast needs vs. desires.

Mr. Kemp explained that the $3 billion was for 30 years of needs. It is hard to anticipate what needs might exist 25 or 30 years from now. It was an unconstrained list developed from each of the jurisdictions. That $3 billion is probably a reasonable and conservative figure for 30 years.

Councilmember Mariscal asked Mr. Kemp to tell the audience what the one project from the original Measure D expenditure plan was that had not been completed.

Mr. Kemp explained that project was the widening of Highway 101 south of Santa Barbara to the Ventura County line to six lanes. The amount of money allocated for that project in the original expenditure plan was $15 million. At the time the plan was approved, the total cost was projected to be around $150 million. The $15 million was seed money and a small part of the total cost of the project. It was hoped that the State and Federal Gas Tax funds would make up the difference. Essentially, the community scuttled the project. After two years of work through the 101 in Motion project, there is now a community consensus to address the congestion on Highway 101 which includes widening the freeway. The current estimated cost for the project is about $400 million.

Councilmember Mariscal asked how many commuters traveled from Ventura to Santa Barbara, and how many individuals would utilize the commuter rail service on a daily basis.

Mr. Kemp replied there were approximately 15,000 people who worked on the south coast of Santa Barbara that commute from Ventura County or points south of there. A commuter train running three times a day is estimated to take about 1,000 riders each way off of the highway during peak periods.

Councilmember Trujillo asked if the polls indicated that the South County would be inclined to widen Highway 101 as well as accept the commuter rail service.

Mr. Tramutola explained that the most popular project in the South County was the widening of Highway 101. There is also a desire on the part of the South County to have a balanced plan.

Councilmember Trujillo stated the concern a lot of people in the North County have is that the South County would shift to commuter rail rather than widening the freeway in that area.

Mr. Tramutola commented that they did not know what the future of rail would be; and they have to be able to set up safeguards so that if rail is not a viable option, that money could be used for other projects. One of the recommendations in the A + B plan is the ability to periodically look at the projects to see if progress is being made; and if not, those resources need to be used elsewhere.

Mr. Kemp stated one of the things they learned in the 101 in Motion process is that the congestion problems on the 101 corridor in the South County are of such a magnitude, that simply doing commuter rail will not solve the problem. Widening the freeway by

itself will not solve the problem. It will take a package of improvements and programs in order to get that freeway moving again.

Mayor Lavagnino asked what the cost would be to move those 1,000 people on commuter rail.

Mr. Kemp stated fully funding a commuter rail system, including both capital and operating expenses over a 30-year period, would be about $200 million. When you compare the benefits of that to widening the freeway, there are not enormous differences in the per person benefit.

Mayor Lavagnino asked if there had been any type of negotiations with Union Pacific Railroad.

Mr. Kemp explained that Union Pacific Railroad owned the track. It was a single track through most of Santa Barbara County. There were some sitings. In order to implement a commuter rail system, there would have to be more sitings constructed to allow for the trains to pass each other. At this stage, it would be pointless to go to Union Pacific and ask them to seriously consider a proposal for commuter rail service when there is no way to pay for it.

Mayor Lavagnino stated he thought some discussions should have taken place already to see if Union Pacific would allow a commuter rail service to use their tracks so they know if it would even be a viable project.

Mayor Lavagnino asked if Ventura County had been asked to participate in the funding of these projects since it would be Ventura County people that would be moved.

Mr. Kemp stated they would be doing that. The unfortunate aspect of the problem is that the congestion occurs in Santa Barbara County, and Ventura County thinks it is a Santa Barbara County problem to correct.

Mayor Lavagnino opened the discussion up to public comment.

Dennis Story, Chair of Coastal Rail Now, explained that they had been doing an outreach in Ventura County at the Farmer's Markets. There were hundreds of people who await the commuter rail. He said they were optimistic that the ridership was there. Train and Lane is going to be the campaign slogan for Measure D. He said he would like to see commuter rail at the same level as widening Highway 101. Currently, commuter rail is funded at 40 percent in Measure A with widening funded at 68 percent. It needs to be equal. Commuter rail is about half the cost of widening Highway 101 and can be up and running in four to five years versus 15 to 20 years for widening.

Bob Hatch, Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce, stated sometime ago the Chamber heard a presentation on Measure D reauthorization. At the time, the Chamber said they would support the Measure D reauthorization because it had been really good for the Santa Maria Valley. Shortly after that he was approached by a member of the Santa Barbara City Council and asked for the Chamber's support and told that there would have to be some deals. He said he had a copy of the Mayor's letter to SBCAG, and the Chamber supported the recommendations made by the Mayor.

Gordon Gill stated he wanted the people of Santa Maria and the North County to understand the great benefits that Measure D has provided over the years. Some of the regional projects such as the widening of Betteravia Road over Highway 101, Stowell Road, Donovan interchange are just a few that would not have occurred if it wasn't for Measure D. It is important that the Council continue to make sure that this community gets its rightful share of the Measure D money and the City controls how that money is spent. It is important to get the word out on how important Measure D has been and those projects that will be important to this area in the future.

Bob Ziener stated in 1960 he lived in Montecito and the congestion problem existed then. Now it is 2006 and the problem has not been successfully addressed. He said he

was a rail aficionado and would like to see more rail service, but the priority is the widening of Highway 101. The future is going to be air transportation.

Mary Jacka stated low income families sometimes can't afford cars. Many families use the bus service. They have said that it is not adequate. Affordable transportation is necessary for these families to get to work, to school, to buy groceries, and get to the doctors. She asked for a fair division of the money, not only for road repairs but also consideration for those who ride bicycles or walk or need an expanded bus service.

Raphaela Moreno, PUEBLO, stated they did a community walk over the weekend and asked the community what they felt the needs were for transportation. One of the great concerns was for a transit center and public transportation. The bus routes need to be increased. There is great need for bike paths for the college.

Harrell Fletcher stated one of the things that had not been mentioned was why there are so many commuters going to the South County from Santa Maria and Lompoc. Thirty years ago they tried to get houses built near the industry with little support from the South County. That caused the people to move to where they could afford a house in Lompoc and Santa Maria. There should be some kind of extra cost to those communities that are not providing their share of housing that caused this need for commuter traffic to the South County from the North County and Ventura County.

Dave Cross stated Measure D is a good measure. You can see the results. It went to roads and infrastructure. Now there is this confusing A + B combination. Instead of 70 percent of the funds going to cities, it is now 60 percent. Instead of funds going to roads and infrastructure, $126 million will be spent on rail service between Ventura and Santa Barbara. He asked why the North County should be asked to pay for these kinds of projects that only they can use. If the South County wants it, they should pay for it. This measure needs to be reworked to get the required number of votes to pass.

Ernest Armenta spoke in opposition to reauthorizing Measure D. He said the bottom line was whether people wanted to pay more taxes for roads. He said he would be voting no because he wanted his sales tax dollars to go back in his pocket so he could feed and cloth his children and make his house payment. Government always says it doesn't have enough money. He said he wanted the measure to fail so he could come back to the Council and the Board of Supervisors and ask them what plan they have to pay for providing the services without Measure D.

Laurie Tamura stated Measure D has been a very good thing for this community. Santa Maria has on its forecast about 10,000 to 15,000 more homes. How many homes are being planned for the South Coast? Any proposal for Measure D should be on a proportional basis because North County is providing the housing. One of the projects that is not on the list is the Union Valley Parkway. That is the economic development route to the Airport District and to Bradley Lands, to help divert traffic off of Clark Avenue and Santa Maria Way. That is a high priority for the south Santa Maria Valley area. She said this was a very confusing measure. She talked about the money lost in the last 20 years over the South County fight about Highway 101.

Deborah Brasket, North County Branch of Santa Barbara County Action Network, said she was in favor of renewing Measure D. She said she thought the formula was based on population and every year it would be adjusted.

Mr. Kemp replied that the local portion of the program in both Measure A and Measure B would be based on population formulas. As Santa Maria continued to grow, it would receive an increasing portion of the Measure A and B revenues.

Deborah Brasket stated her main concern with the Measure A and B proposal was that there be more of a balance between road work and alternative transportation. In the past with Measure D there was not enough money going to alternative transportation. The more alternative systems there are in place, the more people will be taken off the roads.

Mr. Kemp stated Measure A has approximately 33 percent allocated for alternative transportation projects and Measure B would be 52 percent.

Deborah Brasket said since Measure A could pass and Measure B not, she would like to see more money in Measure A for alternative transportation.

John Burke stated in 1993 an Environmental Impact Report was presented that called for the widening of Highway 101 in Santa Barbara. There were three alternatives. Alternative 1 was $92.4 million, Alternative 2 was $128.5 million, and Alternative 3 was a "no build" which is what happened. Now the amount is $428 million to do the project. He said he was disappointed in the 101 in Motion study. It cost SBCAG over $1 million and another year to determine that Highway 101 needed to be widened. The commuter train system equated to $200,000 per person, and the widening of Highway 101 equated to about $32 per person. He said he was involved with an agency that deals with railroads, and it is very difficult.

Fred Schott commented the biggest problem he had with the proposed Measure A + B was going from 70 percent local to 60 percent local. He couldn't see any justification for the people in the North County paying for a commuter rail system. He said he also had a problem with the widening of Highway 101 because the price had gone up $300 million almost totally because of the no growth policies in the South County. North County people should not have to subsidize the South County people who caused the problem in the first place.

Toru Miyoshi stated Measure D was passed when he was on the Board of Supervisors, and at that time it was very focused on maintaining or upgrading the local infrastructure. Some of the proposals in the Measure A + B are very good, but trying to get everything into one bond measure will be confusing to the voters. Measure D was very simple and the voters understood it. He expressed concern about taking local money to fund State highway upgrades. They were going to have to prove that every County was taking local money to fund the State highway system before voters would pass this. The rail system is not appropriate to incorporate in Measures A and B. The freeway expansion in the South County may seem like it is only an advantage to the South County, but the congestion in South County is a road block for the huge market from Southern California to come to the North County and San Luis Obispo County.

There were no further public comments.

Mr. Kemp stated he believed that there were 18 other self-help counties that have sales tax measures for doing State highway improvement projects. Other counties have learned that you can't rely on the State and Federal government.

Councilmember Patino thanked Mr. Kemp and Mr. Tramutola for their presentation. She talked about the benefits to the City of Santa Maria from Measure D. The people of Santa Maria are not going to be able to see the benefits in commuter rail. Because of the political climate in Santa Barbara, Highway 101 did not get widened. Now the people in Santa Maria are being asked to help pay for that. That will be a hard sell. Measure A + B is confusing. Thirty years is a long time. Maybe the time frame should be shorter.

Councilmember Orach stated he had attended some of the meetings when they were trying to develop Measure D. Measure D has been a benefit to the citizens of Santa Maria. It seems as though it would be cheaper to put in a monorail system down the middle of Highway 101 without having to acquire new right of way. He said he didn't think North County voters would see the benefit to a rail system that worked five days a week for the benefit of 1,000 commuters.

Councilmember Mariscal said he wanted people to know he was the City's representative on SBCAG and he encouraged people to email or call him and let him know what they thought. He said he hoped they went away understanding that the City of Santa Maria appreciates the success of Measure D. It has been very good for the community, and the City is interested in seeing it renew.

Councilmember Trujillo also thanked Mr. Kemp and Mr. Tramutola for all the information.

Mayor Lavagnino also thanked them for coming and for their presentation. He said he hoped that when they came back the next time and asked for the City Council's support, some of the issues in his letter were addressed.

The Council recessed for a 10 minute break at 8:50 p.m. and reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT – MIXED USE

Director of Community Development Lindsey gave the staff report. On November 16, 2004, the City Council adopted an ordinance creating Chapter 49 to the zoning ordinance. This ordinance created an opportunity to allow mixed-use developments in most zoning districts with specific design and performance standards. Since the adoption of the Mixed-Use Ordinance, several projects have been submitted to the Community Development Department that appear to be inconsistent with the intent of the Mixed-Use Ordinance, but meet all the development standards contained in the Ordinance. These projects often include a very minimal amount of land uses that are allowed in the underlying zone, with a vast majority of the project being dedicated to mixing in other uses that are not allowed in the zone in the absence of a mixed-use project. In order to protect the intent of the City's zoning districts and ensure that mixed-use projects are balanced mixes of uses compatible with their locations, staff is proposing an amendment to the Ordinance that would require all mixed-use developments to have a minimum of 51 percent of the project floor area devoted to uses allowed in the underlying zoning district. On February 15, 2006, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2403 recommending that the City Council file a Negative Declaration for the subject zoning text amendment and Resolution No. 2404 recommending that the City Council approve an ordinance amending the Mixed-Use Development Standards contained in Chapter 49 of Title 12 of the Santa Maria Municipal Code.

Councilmember Mariscal asked if the projects recently approved by the Planning Commission and City Council met the requirements of the ordinance amendment.

Director Lindsey replied that they did.

Mayor Lavagnino opened the public hearing. Hearing no requests to speak, Mayor Lavagnino closed the public hearing.

Resolution No. 2006-32 was adopted approving a Negative Declaration for E-2005-042, Zoning Text Amendment, Z-2005-002 related to Mixed-Use Development Standards on motion by Councilmember Orach, seconded by Councilmember Patino, and carried on the following roll-call vote:

AYES:	Councilmember Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Resolution No. 2006-32 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION (E-2005-042) FOR ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS, Z-2005-002.

Ordinance No. 2006-03, amending Chapter 49 of the Zoning Ordinance related to Mixed-Use Developments was introduced by title only for first reading and continued to the next meeting for second reading and adoption on motion by Councilmember Orach, seconded by Councilmember Patino, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmember Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Ordinance No. 2006-03 introduced. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING CHAPTER 49 (MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS) TO TITLE 12 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE, Z-2005-002.

ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT – INDUSTRIAL ZONES

Director of Community Development Lindsey gave the staff report. Staff identified unclear and inconsistent wording within the Building Sites sections of each industrial zoning district. The proposed zoning text amendments would make the Building Site section language and format consistent across the three industrial districts. It would also give the Planning Commission additional flexibility to approve lots with less than the minimum area (15,000 square feet) and allow parcels with less than standard widths through the Planned Development (PD) Permit process. On February 15, 2006, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2401 recommending that the City Council approve an ordinance amending Chapters 15, 16 and 17 of Title 12 of the Santa Maria Municipal Code.

Mayor Lavagnino opened the public hearing.

Gordon Gill stated eight months ago they started a project on the west side of A Street. They were scheduled to go before the Planning Commission when they found some language in the Zoning Ordinance with regard to two of the industrial zones that did not allow the Planned Development project they had submitted. Immediately, Bill Shipsey and Wendy Stockton met with them to come up with the solution that is before the Council. It gives the City greater flexibility with regard to the industrial areas in the future. He requested the Council support the ordinance amendment.

Hearing no further requests to speak, Mayor Lavagnino closed the public hearing.

Ordinance No. 2006-04, amending Chapters 15, 16 and 17 of the Zoning Ordinance related to building sites in Industrial Zones was introduced by title only for first reading and continued to the next meeting for second reading and adoption on motion by Councilmember Mariscal, seconded by Councilmember Orach, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmember Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Ordinance No. 2006-04 introduced. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO CHAPTERS 15, 16 AND 17 OF TITLE 12 OF THE SANTA MARIA MUNICIPAL CODE, Z-2005-001.

BLOSSER SOUTHWEST SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT

Planner III Shipsey gave the staff report. Staff identified unclear wording regarding the creation of mobile home lots within the RMH Zoning District of the Blosser Southwest Specific Plan. The proposed amendment seeks to clarify potential confusion about the types of housing permitted in the RMH District. Amended Section 3.1.5.a would allow manufactured or modular housing on permanent foundations and thereby classify such structures as mobile homes within the Blosser Southwest Specific Plan area.

Additionally, the proposed amendment to Section 3.1.5.f would give the Planning Commission additional flexibility to approve mobile home spaces or lots with less than the minimum widths through the Planned Development Permit process. These proposed amendments would only apply to the Blosser Southwest Specific Plan area. On February 15, 2006, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2402 recommending that the City Council approve an ordinance amending Section 3.1.5 of the Blosser Southwest Specific Plan.

Mayor Lavagnino opened the public hearing.

Jason McCoy, RRM Design Group, stated he represented the property owner and they were in support of the ordinance amendment.

Hearing no further requests to speak, Mayor Lavagnino closed the public hearing.

Ordinance No. 2006-05, amending Section 3.1.5 of the Blosser Southwest Specific Plan was introduced by title only for first reading and continued to the next meeting for second reading and adoption on motion by Councilmember Trujillo, seconded by Councilmember Orach, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmember Mariscal, Orach, Patino, Trujillo, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Ordinance No. 2006-05 introduced. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTION 3.1.5 OF THE BLOSSER SOUTHWEST SPECIFIC PLAN, GPZ-2006-001, SPZ-2006-001.

REPORT BY CITY MANAGER

City Manager Ness reported on items for the next regular City Council meeting on March 21, 2006, including a public hearing for the Measure D Five Year Program of Projects, an appointment to the All-America City Committee, award of bid for the Public Library, and a presentation to be made by Pioneer Valley High School students regarding a street name change from Fremont Street to Panther Drive.

ORAL REPORTS OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Orach commended the Recreation and Parks Department and the Police Department for the quick removal of graffiti at United Way.

Councilmember Patino reported on the public forum held on February 23rd at the Abel Maldonado Community Youth Center where Dr. Meg Meeker spoke on STD's. She also announced that there would be another public forum on March 28th in the City Hall Council Chambers sponsored by Fighting Back Santa Maria on underage drinking.

Councilmember Mariscal talked about an article in the Los Angeles Times specifically about Santa Barbara County and some of the items discussed at this meeting. He encouraged people to go to the Los Angeles Times website and read the article which was written from an outsiders point of view. He also talked about an article in the Santa Barbara News Press about the best musical buy for your dollar and it was the Santa Maria Philharmonic.

CLOSED SESSION

The City Council recessed to a Closed Session at 9:20 p.m. for Conference with Legal Counsel regarding existing litigation pursuant to Subsection (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9 to discuss Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District v. City of Santa Maria, and Conference with Legal Counsel regarding Threat of Litigation (1 matter).

After the Closed Session, the following was announced.

Conference with Legal Counsel regarding Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District v. City of Santa Maria – Status report. No reportable action.

Conference with Legal Counsel regarding Threat of Litigation (1 matter) – Report by City Attorney. No reportable action.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before the City Council at this time, the meeting was declared adjourned at 10:24 p.m. by order of Mayor Lavagnino.

APPROVED

3-21-06
Date

Chief Deputy City Clerk of the City of Santa Maria and ex officio Clerk of the City Council

Mayor of the City of Santa Maria

ATTEST

Chief Deputy City Clerk